

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Danny C. Vogel

) Group Art Unit: 2668

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

Serial No.: 09/919,221

) Examiner: Steven Blount

MAY 10 2006

Filed: July 31, 2001

) Atty. Docket No.: 01-138

For: EFFICIENT HIGH DENSITY
VOICE PROCESSOR**RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION**
Restriction/Election RequirementHon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This response is presented to the Office Action mailed January 10, 2006, wherein the Examiner required restriction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121. Election is hereby made, *with traverse*, to prosecute Group II, i.e., claims 10-23.

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the restriction is respectfully requested. In the instant case, a first office action on the merits has already been received and a response made. Hence, all original claims have previously been considered.

Restriction is not required by 35 U.S.C. §121, as suggested in the Office Action. Congress wisely granted the *discretion* to restrict applications. According to 35 U.S.C. §121 "... the Commissioner *may* require the application to be restricted..." (emphasis added).

Furthermore, MPEP § 803 lists two criteria that must be present for restriction to be proper:

- 1) The inventions must be independent or distinct as claimed; and
- 2) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required.

In searching the Group II claims, the class and subclass for the Group I claims will undoubtedly be searched, to ensure that no relevant art is overlooked. For this

BEST AVAILABLE COPY